



Meeting Summary

Citizen Advisory Committee – Comprehensive Plan Update

January 21, 2016 - 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Hillsboro Main Library – Event Room

2850 Brookwood Pkwy

Hillsboro, OR 97124

Members Present

Mica Annis, Steve Callaway, Mark Cardinaux, Aron Carleson, Katie Eyre, Wil Fuentes, Bonnie Kookan, Tricia Mortell, Daniel Nguyen, Ahne Oosterhof, Ken Phelan

Members Excused

John Godsey, Glenn Miller, Gwynne Pitts, Bryan Welsh

Staff Present

Nick Baker, Laura Kelly, Aaron Ray, Dan Rutzick, Laura Weigel

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting opened with introductions of the committee members and staff.

Minutes – December 10, 2015

The minutes were approved after changing “study session” to “work session” on page 6.

Urbanization - Background Report and Draft Goals & Policies

Dan Rutzick reviewed the contents of the Urbanization Background Report. He presented maps to help explain the recent history and anticipated future of annexations and urban growth boundary expansions in Hillsboro. The key issues and challenges identified in the report included:

- Outdated urban service and planning agreements – UGB expansions over the last 14 years are not reflected in urban service and planning agreements with Washington County.
- Unincorporated county planning and urban service provision – The Aloha-Reedville area is unincorporated, and thus, not subject to planning efforts by any city, only Washington County. Planning staff raised this as a challenge for delivering full service provisions now and in the future.
- Constraints from House Bill 4078 – HB 4078 led to a removal of over 2,000 acres of urban reserve land.

- Conditions on new employment lands – The Meek Road area, recently brought inside the UGB, must have one 100 acre and two 50 acre pieces of land as a condition.
- Newly created county islands – County islands may be created as newly urbanized areas become developed.

The opportunities identified in the report included:

- Urban reserves land – Witch Hazel South is an urban reserve, and a great opportunity for future growth.
- Climate change mitigation and adaption – Staff explained that planning efforts in South Hillsboro can incorporate climate change mitigation practices.

Questions from the committee included:

- What is the difference between urban and rural reserve land? Staff responded that urban reserves are where the UGB could expand into in the next 50 years. Rural reserves are agriculture, farm, forest and other lands farther away from urban land. It gives rural residents peace of mind that the UGB will not expand into their areas in the near future.
- What is the typical distance between the UGB and rural reserves? Staff responded that the distance from rural reserves to the UGB varies. Some areas are adjacent to the UGB, while some are several miles away.
- How are residents in South Hillsboro going to get to employment areas in North Hillsboro? Staff responded that Hillsboro has been actively engaged with regional partners to expand access to and from South Hillsboro. Tri-Met has said they will run a new bus line from South Hillsboro to North Hillsboro.
- How are future South Hillsboro residents going to get across the train tracks parallel to TV Highway? Staff responded that the Urbanization Goals and Policies will attempt to address this, as well as the new Transportation System Plan, which is in development. Committee members discussed new and proposed road extensions that will serve the South Hillsboro area.
- How do county islands appear? Staff responded that county islands appear over time due to voluntary annexation. Property owners decide to voluntarily annex themselves in newly urbanized areas in order to receive city services and benefits, and in exchange, pay more taxes. Some owners decline to be annexed, thus creating “islands” of unincorporated areas surrounded by city boundaries.

The conversation transitioned to a discussion of Urbanization Goals & Policies. Staff reviewed the policies under each goal with the committee and asked for input, suggestions, or questions. Staff explained that almost every policy and multiple implementation measures from the Urbanization section of Hillsboro’s existing Comprehensive Plan are being carried over to the new Plan, in addition to new policies. The CAC’s feedback included:

- Goal 1: Accommodate long-range population and employment growth within the Hillsboro Planning Area.
 - General Discussion: Staff explained this goal was taken verbatim from the existing Comprehensive Plan. The Committee inquired about policies specifying residential densities. Staff responded that Urbanization – Goal 3, as well as some Housing Goals & Policies address residential density.

- Policy 1.3: Staff indicated that this is a new policy, and intended for planning newly-incorporated areas on the edge of the city, as well as efficient use of land in existing areas in the city. The committee asked about the regulations regarding units per acre. Staff responded that Metro requires 10 units per acre on average throughout the city.. The committee discussed problems that increased density would create, like a lack of parking spaces. Staff emphasized that this policy is designed to increase density only in areas that can sufficiently accommodate it, like Regional and Town Centers.
- Goal 2: Ensure consistency of local and regional plans.
 - General Discussion: The committee recommended that “urbanized” and “unurbanized” have definitions developed.
 - Policy 2.6: The committee asked if this policy would lead to a situation where the city hopes to annex an unincorporated unurbanized area, but without a community-level plan in place. Staff responded that it is a state requirement to do community-level planning before land is brought in the UGB.
- Goal 3: Plan, develop, and enhance the urban built environment to meet the needs of community members of all ages, abilities, cultures, and incomes.
 - General Discussion: The committee raised the issues of gentrification and displacement, and brought up the possibility of including language in a policy to directly address their impact. Staff indicated that this is a good idea, and will consider how to incorporate such language into the Comprehensive Plan. Gentrification may be better addressed in a different section.
 - Policy 3.2: The committee asked if “evaluate” is a strong enough term to enforce this policy. Staff indicated that they are considering changing the wording to make it more effective.
 - Policy 3.3: Staff indicated that they have received comments from the TAC to better encompass all people. The committee discussed potential language to include in this policy. In particular, “sizes” over “cultures” was debated, and “preferences” was suggested for inclusion. It was decided that staff will reconsider the language of this policy.
 - Policy 3.4: The committee suggested replacing the term “opportunities” instead of “uses”. Staff responded that the intention is to offer a variety of uses, and that employers will offer the opportunities for employment.
- Goal 4: Provide for the orderly and efficient extension of public facilities and services.
 - Policy 4.5: Staff indicated that the language of this policy is under review after the feedback received from the TAC. The key issue is that there may be cases in the future where all city residents pay the cost of providing new services to an area.
 - Policy 4.6: The committee asked if annexation can be stopped if services are not available. Staff responded that the intention of this policy is to address this issue, although the language is currently ambiguous. New language is being developed.

- Goal 5: Enhance compatibility between urban uses and agricultural and forest uses on adjacent land outside the Urban Growth Boundary.
 - General Discussion: The committee stated that this appears to be a responsibility of the County, not the City. Staff responded that it is a requirement of the state for cities, in addition to counties, to ensure compatibility of uses.

Noise – Background Report and Draft Goals & Policies

Nick Baker reviewed the contents of the Noise Background Report. He stated that noise has quality of life impacts, that it is linked to a growing list of health issues, and that noise regulation is largely a city's responsibility to manage. Some of the tools that can be used to reduce noise are policies, design regulations, and construction methods. Comments from the committee included:

- Instead of specifically mentioning barking dogs as domestic noises, it is suggested that it be expanded to include all animal noises.
- Buses and trucks contribute to noise pollution, and this fact should be considered in developing a policy.
- Determine the City's role in managing and regulating noise generated from the airport. Staff stated they are working on a way to include airport noise reduction efforts and include airport noise contour maps in the Comprehensive Plan, but that it largely falls under the authority of the Port of Portland and federal government.
- Construction noise impacts are an issue. Construction at Orenco Station started early in the morning during the summer, and that it could be heard from large number of nearby residents. Staff responded that the Community Development Code has limits for the hours in which certain types of noise can be generated.
- The presence of noise mitigation design techniques and standards, in reference to Policy 1.3. Staff indicated that the teeth for this policy will be articulated in the implementation measures and that the language of Policy 1.3 is sufficiently strong. Staff stated that "minimize" is strong language.

Questions from the committee included:

- Does Hillsboro own equipment with which to monitor noise? Staff responded that code enforcement officers do have noise measuring equipment, and that they are trained to use it in response to a noise complaint. However, noise complaints about the airport are left to the Port to enforce.

Staff reviewed the policies under Noise Management with the committee and asked for input, suggestions, or questions.

- Goal 1 – Limit excessive and harmful noise to protect public health, wellness, and safety.
 - General Discussion – The committee asked if "nuisance" should be included in the Goal 1 language. Staff responded that this, or language similar to this, would be included. The committee also suggested "quality of life" be included in Goal 1. Staff responded in favor. The committee then discussed noise generated from the MAX light rail and crossings, and if there are construction techniques to mitigate noise to nearby

apartments. Staff responded that the Community Development Code will be updated to include implementation measures that address the new Comprehensive Plan, and that the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan update is to provide guidance in writing the code.

- Policy 1.1 – Staff clarified that this policy will provide a basis for understanding more about noise issues, particularly where and when problems occur. It would be impossible to implement noise reduction strategies without knowing what the problem is.
- Policy 1.2 – Staff indicated that “zoning” may need to be included in the policy language.
- Policy 1.3 – The committee commented that technologies exist to reduce and redirect noise, especially for trains.
- Policy 1.4 – The committee stated that there’s no language requiring cooperation with other entities to reduce noise. Staff stated they will include a new policy per the recommendation.
- Policy 1.5 – The committee stated that the structure of this policy makes it very difficult and time-consuming for users to find all of the relevant codes and standards since they’re located throughout various other plans, codes, and standards. The committee asked if there is an index to ease this process. Staff responded that they do not, but that it could be developed as an implementation measure.
- Policy 1.6 – Staff stated that federal rules allow municipalities to designate train horn quiet zones. Staff also stated that “train horn quiet zone” needs to be added to the definitions. The committee asked if there needs to be, or should be, a disclosure on the title of a property if it is within a particular overlay zone that generates noise, like the airport overlay zone. Staff said they will discuss including this in a policy.

Access to Local Food – Background Report and Draft Goals & Policies

Laura Weigel led a lengthy discussion on the feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee and Citizen Advisory Committee, as well as the updated policy language. Discussion topics included:

- Staff indicated that the most important takeaway is to change the focus from “local food” to “locally-grown food”. The updated Goals & Policies primarily reflect this change.
- “Healthy” was removed from Goal 1 because it brought up a lot of controversy in TAC. However, the committee felt that “healthy” is not sufficiently controversial to exclude from the Goals & Policies, and that in the vast majority of cases it would not be controversial at all.
- Staff clarified to the committee that “local” in this context refers just to food grown in Hillsboro.
- The committee suggested adding “locally grown and **close in.**”
- Staff stated that a definition for “urban agriculture” will need a definition.
- Staff stated that there is no explicit language regarding garden plots, and that they will revisit where to include this.

Questions from the committee included:

- Is there a definition for how far “local” extends to? Committee discussed different definitions for “local”. Staff responded that the intent is control what happens inside the city, not food grown elsewhere and brought into the city.
- Should the city take charge of or facilitate farmer’s markets expansions? Staff responded the city has the authority to help facilitate the expansion, but not to take it over. A discussion over

the exact intent of the policy took place, with the conclusion that staff will revisit the policy language.

- Should local and/or healthy food access to restaurants be included in the policy language? Staff responded that does not constitute a land use issue.

Upcoming Meeting Schedules and Topics

- Staff stated that committee should inform staff if they have any comments on changes made to Recreation Goals & Policies.
- The next meeting will take place on Thursday, February 18 from 4:00-6:00pm in the Community Room at the Hillsboro Main Library.

Public Comment

No members of the public offered comment at the meeting.

Adjournment

With no additional business to consider, the CAC meeting was adjourned.